

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say to my good friend that the gentleman knows that under former Presidents of the Democrat majority rule when we have had constitutional amendments come to the floor, we are following generally the same procedure, because it is so terribly complex. I would hope that we could entertain any legitimate substitute and have it made in order. However, there is going to be a constraint of time. Probably an ample number of amendments might be three or four on your side and possibly one on our side that may not be supported by the Republican leadership necessarily.

We want to be fair to everyone. We want to give everybody their fair shot. I would hope that that is the procedure we could arrive at.

We are going to be holding that hearing, incidentally, on Monday, January 23, that is a week from Monday, at 1 p.m. Again we hope that the membership will come up and we can discuss it and we would be glad to consult with the minority.

Mr. BONIOR. Does the gentleman intend to employ a procedure known as king-of-the-hill or queen-of-the-hill or do you plan on inventing a new procedure for us and surprising us?

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman knows that this gentleman has always been opposed to king-of-the-hill, where a substitute or an amendment could pass not having received the largest number of votes. That is not going to happen anymore. If we have any procedure at all, it will be the fair procedure of the substitute passing with the most votes wins. That is the way it should be on the floor of this House, and that is the way it should be in any committee.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague from New York and my friend from Texas.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, January 17, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

A VIEW ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, the Great Depression dealt the biggest economic blow this Nation has ever faced. The epidemic seemed never-ending, sweeping everything away in its path of economic destruction.

In the election of 1932, with the economy still contracting, Franklin Roosevelt complained of Hoover's deficit spending and raised the issue of the need to balance the Federal budget. However, by the end of the decade, the economy was improving under the direction of President Roosevelt and his New Deal policies, without calling for a constitutional amendment. Now, in 1995, we are visiting this issue again. As we dialog today, though, we must reflect on the lessons learned from yesterday.

As students of the economy, we know that if an economy is operating below its capacity to produce, the result is a cause for cyclical downturn. And if the Government needs to raise revenues or must spend less—requirements that will be unconditionally placed on this institution if the balanced budget amendment is passed—economic activity depresses further. Therefore, the efforts during the early 1930's to balance the budget might be theoretically counted as an economic contributor to prolonging the depression cycle.

This lesson rings as a reminder that there are situations which require economic responses other than constitutionally mandating that the Federal budget be balanced.

I urge my colleagues to further dialog on this issue.

BUDGET CUTS NEEDED FOR GAO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the 104th Congress begins to examine areas to cut Federal spending, this Member would like to convey his strong support for reduced funding levels for the General Accounting Office [GAO], an investigative arm of the U.S. Congress.

Last year during consideration of the fiscal year 1995 legislative branch appropriations bill, this Member offered an amendment to cut funding for GAO by 5 percent below the fiscal year 1994 level. Unfortunately, this amendment failed by a close vote even though three committee chairmen vigorously worked against it on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, during a time when the American public has called for reduced Federal spending, the GAO has continued to undergo funding increases. Most recently, GAO received a funding level

of \$430.2 million in fiscal year 1994, and the House fiscal year 1994 legislative branch appropriations bill included a fiscal year 1995 funding level of \$439.5 million—an increase of \$9.4 million. The final fiscal year 1995 conference report for legislative branch appropriations included \$449 million for GAO, \$10 million more than the House-passed bill. This Member's amendment would have reduced the fiscal year 1995 funding level of GAO to \$408.7 million, a reduction of \$30.9 million from the committee-approved bill, and \$21.5 million below fiscal year 1994's funding level.

This Member strongly believes that GAO is an agency where growth is out of control. It is an agency which also has not been responsive to individual Members, especially those who serve in the minority. The quality of work produced by the GAO is increasingly shoddy. While the quality of the work varies dramatically, unfortunately and inappropriately, all GAO reports are given the same high respect and credibility simply because they are GAO products. The level of personnel and budgetary resources provided to GAO for its work now is excessive and has grown disproportionately when compared with other congressional support agencies. In addition, GAO resources are also used in certain questionable cases for consultants, training, and for various unnecessary expenses. Concern has also been expressed that GAO is more interested in getting headlines than in supporting the Congress with required information.

From 1985 to 1993, the number of GAO investigations doubled from 457 per year to 915. In addition, GAO's budget jumped from \$46.9 million in 1965 to our current spending level of \$449 million, a percentage increase of nearly 1,000 percent in unadjusted dollars.

In fiscal year 1994, the number of full-time equivalent positions at GAO were reduced from the fiscal year 1993 amount by approximately \$6 million and 100 positions. However, additional cuts are still needed to account for the past growth at this agency, which this Member will outline. In 1980, for example, funding for GAO staff cost \$204 million. By 1985 that had grown to \$299 million. In 1988 it was \$330 million, and in 1989, \$346 million. The average increase between 1980 and 1990 was 8 percent per year. Then, in 1991, GAO was increased by 14 percent, to a total of \$409 million. In 1992, GAO received another 8-percent increase to \$443 million.

The GAO is the largest support agency for Congress, and, incredibly, its budget represents more than one-quarter of the total fiscal year 1995 legislative branch appropriations. GAO's budget is 7½ times the size of the Congressional Research Service, 19 times the size of the Congressional Budget Office, and 20 times the size of the Office of Technology Assessment.

According to a Democratic Study Group [DSG] special report issued on

May 24, 1994, in January 1994 the number of GAO employees was 4,597. This level is nearly as large as the staffing level of 4,617 for the entire Library of Congress—the largest library in the world—which also includes the staff of the Congressional Research Service.

Mr. Speaker, here is something that should catch the attention of the House and the Congress. According to this same study, in 1994, GAO's staffing level was nearly 2½ times as large as the 1,849 House committee staff members—during the 103d Congress, and more than one-half as large as the 7,340 individuals employed by all of the Members of the House together.

The DSG study also compares funding levels for the legislative branch from 1979 to 1994, in inflation-adjusted dollars. According to the DSG, the General Accounting Office has received one of the largest increases in funding for the entire legislative branch at an inflation-adjusted level of 13.5 percent during this time period.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, now hear this: The funding for other areas of the legislative branch have actually declined since 1979 in inflation-adjusted dollars, according to this study. For example, the Library of Congress received a 17.6 percent reduction, CBO was reduced by 3.8 percent, and Members' staff has even been reduced by 6.4 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars since 1979. But, again, the GAO has an inflation-adjusted increase in its budget of 13.5 percent.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly urges his colleagues to support efforts to reduce the funding level of the GAO. This Member will continue to support any Budget Committee or Appropriations Committee efforts regarding this matter and offer assistance in accomplishing this objective. If such appropriate cuts are not forthcoming, this Member will prepare to again offer budget reduction amendments for the GAO to be offered on the House floor.

□ 1050

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, last November the American people sent a clear message to Washington: Get the government off our backs. Last week Congressman DELAY and I introduced a bill to do just that. It is called the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995. And what it does is put a moratorium in place on Federal regulations until June 30, 1995 so that we can enact the Contract With America and change the way the regulatory systems do business here in Washington.

This bill is a critical first step toward cutting bureaucratic redtape and protecting the middle class from the hidden tax of regulation. The Clinton

administration has admitted that regulations cost Americans at least \$430 billion each year. Leading economists have projected that Federal regulation costs the average family between \$8,000 and \$10,000 a year. The hidden tax of regulations affects everyone, and the middle class is hit hardest of all. Moms pay higher prices to put food on the table, and mothers and fathers pay higher prices for shoes for their children and for all kinds of services. Our mothers, our wives, our daughters are subject to greater risks of breast cancer because of the bungling at the FDA and the bureaucratic redtape that it takes to get new products on the market. Small business men and women spend over \$1 billion each year filling out redtape and other forms that the Federal Government requires. You know, Mr. Speaker, it has taken a shorter time than that to win wars in this country.

While these very human costs alone justify the moratorium on regulation, there is an even more ominous threat to our society that is not reflected in the figures that I mentioned. I am speaking of the strangling choke hold that bureaucratic redtape has on American spirit. Perhaps the most eloquent expression of this was made over 150 years ago by Alexis DeToqueville who observed that if America was ever to be ruled by a tyrant again it would come not in the form of a human tyrant, but in the form of a choking fog of regulation.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been elected to liberate the middle class and all Americans from this choking fog of regulation. Next Thursday, January 19, the House Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs will hold hearings on our bill to create a regulatory moratorium and to do just that.

On December 12, House Republican and Senate leaders asked President Clinton to voluntarily freeze new regulations for the first 100 days of the new Congress, but his administration has not chosen to do that. So our legislation will provide such a moratorium. It is extremely urgent since the administration's regulatory plan shows that the Clinton administration has about 4,300 new regulations that we plan to take up in 1995.

The moratorium on these new regulations will temporarily stop the Federal Government from loading even more burden onto the middle class and onto the American taxpayer and thereby give Congress time to pass the Contract With America and change the way we do regulations in this country from now on.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Regulatory Transition Act along with 51 other Members of Congress and encourage the remaining Members of this House to sign on to the bill and thereby demonstrate to the American people that we have heard the message and we will change the way we do business here in Washington. We will cut back

on the regulatory redtape and provide more freedom for all Americans to go about their business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 15 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

[Mr. MCINNIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BONIOR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEREUTER) to revise and extend their remarks and included extraneous material:)

Mr. GILLMOR, for 5 minutes, on January 17 and 19.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCINTOSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COYNE.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mrs. LINCOLN.

Ms. PELOSI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BONIOR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TORRES.

Ms. KAPTUR in two instances.

Mr. RICHARDSON in three instances.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. REED.

Mr. CLAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEREUTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOKE.

Mr. MCKEON.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the